

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/998,109	11/30/2001	Sean S. Josephson	15-NM-6150 (070191-0324)	4424
7:	590 02/11/2003			
Paul S. Hunter			EXAMINER	
FOLEY & LARDNER Firstar Center 777 East Wisconsin Avenue Milwaukee, WI 53202-5367			CONLEY, FREDRICK C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3673 DATE MAILED: 02/11/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	09/998,109	JOSEPHSON ET AL.	$\bigcap$				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Fredrick C Conley	3673	4				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RETHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, and If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by significant the provided by the Office later than three months after the meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DN. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to the control of the contro	timely filed  ays will be considered timely.  m the mailing date of this commu  IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	unication.				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on							
	This action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.  Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are pending in the applica	ation						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,2,4,5,7-16,20 and 21</u> is/are rejected.							
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>3,6 and 17-19</u> is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction ar	nd/or election requirement.						
Application Papers	·						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exan	niner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a	ccepted or b) objected to by the Ex	aminer.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to		, ,					
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.							
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.							
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	e Examiner.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for	eign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	(a)-(d) or (f).					
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:							
1. Certified copies of the priority docum							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the Internationa  * See the attached detailed Office action for a	l Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		ge				
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dom	estic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	(e) (to a provisional ap	plication).				
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for don	• •						
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No	) 5) 🔲 Notice of Informa	ary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Il Patent Application (PTO-15					
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 04-01) Office	ce Action Summary	Part of Pa	per No. 5				

Art Unit: 3673

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 7 contains the trademark/trade name Kevlar. Where a trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. See *Ex parte Simpson*, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. A trademark or trade name is used to identify a source of goods, and not the goods themselves. Thus, a trademark or trade name does not identify or describe the goods associated with the trademark or trade name. In the present case, the trademark/trade name is used to identify/describe the fastening means and, accordingly, the identification/description is indefinite.

Art Unit: 3673

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 16, and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 4,567,894 to Bergman.

In reference to claim 1, Bergman discloses a patient transport system for transporting a patient from a magnetic resonance imaging system to a second imaging system, the patient transport system comprising:

an elongated member 118 having an upper surface configured to support a patient;

a first coupling mechanism 16 coupled to the elongated member configured to removably couple the elongated member to the magnetic resonance imaging system; and

a second coupling mechanism 59 coupled to the elongated member configured to removably couple the elongated member to a second imaging system.

In reference to claim 16, Bergman discloses a patient transport system for transporting a patient between two different medical imaging modalities, the patient transport system comprising:

a patient support surface/(patient cradle)(col. 3 lines 41-43) comprising an end compatible with a coupling arrangement 16 on an imaging system;

Art Unit: 3673

a table 118 separable from the patient support surface and configured to receive the patient support surface and to move the patient support surface between different rooms of a building; and

a coupling device 59 configured to couple the patient support surface to the table, wherein the coupling device comprises an actuator (col. 7 lines 14-21) configured to disconnect the patient support surface from the table.

Regarding claim 20, wherein the table comprises wheels configured to move the table along a floor (fig. 4).

Regarding claim 21, wherein the actuator is actuated by a human operator.

Claims 9-10, 12-13, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by 5,490,297 to Bradcovich et al.

In reference to claim 9, Bradcovich discloses a patient transport system for transporting a patient in a medical imaging environment, comprising an elongated patient support member having a first end opposite a second end, wherein the first end is configured to be coupled to a magnetic resonance imaging device and the second end is configured to be coupled to an X-ray imaging device (col. 5 lines 59-62).

Regarding claim 10, wherein the elongated patient support member is suitable for use in both a magnetic resonance imaging environment and an X-ray imaging device (col. 5 lines 42-49).

Art Unit: 3673

Regarding claim 12, further comprising a plurality of wheels 24 coupled to the elongated patient support member configured to roll the elongated patient support member along a floor.

Regarding claim 13, wherein the elongated patient support member comprises a table 126 and a patient cradle 128 resting on the table, wherein the table comprises a mounting surface configured to receive the patient cradle in a substantially fixed relationship (col. 6 lines 13-26), wherein the table includes a plurality of wheels 24 configured to roll the elongated patient support member along the floor.

Regarding claim 15, wherein the elongated patient support member is configured to support a cantilevered human patient load at a second end (col. 6 lines18-21).

Art Unit: 3673

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 4, and 5, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 4,567,894 to Bergman in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,490,297 to Bradcovich et al.

In reference to claims 2, 4, and 5, Bergman discloses all of the Applicant's claimed limitations except for the elongated member comprising a cradle and a table wherein the cradle rest on the table. Bradcovich discloses a cradle 128 resting on a table 126 of an elongated member. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to employ the cradle and table with the elongated member in order to provide an imaging table which can transport and support a patient between MRI and X-ray devices within an medical center.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 4,567,894 to Bergman in view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,145,612 to Cooper.

In reference to claim 7, Bergman discloses all of the Applicant's claimed limitations except for the elongated member comprised of Kevlar. Cooper discloses an elongated member comprised of Kevlar (col. 3 lines 28-30). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the elongate

Art Unit: 3673

member comprised of Kevlar in order to provide a composite that results in a scratch resistant patient support surface.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 4,567,894 to Bergman in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,210,893 to Uosaki et al.

In reference to claim 8, Bergman discloses all of the Applicant's claimed limitations except for the elongated member having an arcuately shaped cross-section. Uosaki discloses that it is well known for an elongated member 30 to have an arcuately shaped cross-section (fig. 2). Since it is well known it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have an arcuately shaped elongate member in order to move a portion of a subject to the apparatus for diagnosis.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,490,297 to Bradcovich et al. in view of 4,145,612 to Cooper.

In reference to claim 11, Bradcovich discloses all of the Applicant's claimed limitations except for the elongated member comprised of Kevlar. Cooper discloses an elongated member comprised of Kevlar (col. 3 lines 28-30). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the elongate member comprised of Kevlar in order to provide a composite that results in a scratch resistant patient support surface.

Art Unit: 3673

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,490,297 to Bradcovich et al., in view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,567,894 to Bergman.

Regarding claim 14, Bradcovich discloses all of the Applicant's claimed limitations except for a manually-actuated locking mechanism. Bergman discloses a manually-actuated system (108,110,154,156,162). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ a manually actuated system to provide a powering means that positions the cradle relative to the table in order to prevent any electrical connections or objects between the table and the magnet that may disturb the homogeneity of the magnetic field during imaging.

## Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3, 6 and 17-19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 3673

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fredrick C Conley whose telephone number is 308-7468. The examiner can normally be reached on m-th m-fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Shackelford can be reached on 308-2978. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 305-7687 for regular communications and 3057687 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 308-2168.

February 6, 2003

TERI PHAM LUU PRIMARY EXAMINER